I wish I could find programs like that today for my little girl to watch. The point is there were more ways back then for people to produce interesting programs and get them distributed on television. Now the media outlets are pretty much controlled by huge multinational corporations.

The best programs don't get aired because of the obsession to maximize profits.

Today, we are bombarded with sensational violent mindless shows. The people of this country have no way to use airways that supposedly belong to us except for local cable access TV. The FCC should be deeply concerned about what is happening. They should protect the interests of the people and look for ways to use their regulating power to encourage the independence of the smaller stations throughout the country. We don't want Fox and Viacom owning every station we turn to on the dial. We do not want one corporation quietly buying up 1200 channels so they can maximize profits by making pure programs. This is already happening in radio.

Please do not make the same mistake in television. If we do still live in a democracy which is at work in this room today, then we need to keep television open for as many voices as possible.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

	195
1	I know I speak for so many parents in this
2	country who grew up loving TV and now worry about
3	letting our kids watch it at all.
4	(Applause.)
5	MR. KRATTENMAKER: Thank you, Ms. Burrows.
6	Mr. Persinger (Phonetic)?
7	MR. PERSINGER: Hello, Chairman Powell and
8	Commissioners. Thank you for the privilege to speak
9	to you today.
10	My name is Silver Persinger. I live in
11	Richmond, Virginia. I come today to tell you to
12	oppose removing restrictions on ownership of media
13	outlets.
14	I come to you today, before you today as
15	an .advocate of the golden American ideals of
16	democracy, free speech, freedom of press, liberty and
17	freedom.
18	What we all know, but what hasn't been
19	said is that television is the most powerful source of
20	propaganda in this country, a major source of
21	information, education and social values. Information
22	is power, but information is also wealth.
23	This marketplace of ideas and the funny
24	thing about ideas is it's hard <b>to</b> sell them. Ideas
25	inherently are free and your whole all this stuff

1	is centered around the economy and I identify myself
2	as a socialist and I feel real threatened by this
3	dependency on economy to justify every action and I
4	don't know, I just don't see <b>a</b> real place for
5	socialism being discussed in commercial media which
6	looks like the way we're heading.
7	This is an essential tool of political
8	speech and it's largely denied to ordinary people. If
9	you truly want diversity, you need to increase public
10	access to the media.
11	Just look just take a <b>look</b> at the rules
12	already enacted by the Commission. One of the
13	Commissioners or panelists mentioned that the first
14	rules banning ownership of multiple radio stations
15	occurred in 1927. I think you would be forgetting the
16	wisdom of previous FCC Commissions. These rules were
17	instituted at a time when there were fewer stations
18	and only about five years after the initial radio boom
19	of 1922 and 1923. The Commission recognized the
20	importance of the distribution of information.
21	MR. KRATTENMAKER: Thank you, Mr.
22	Persinger.
23	Is Mr. Vuckmer there?
24	MR. VUCKMER: Thank you. My name is Bob
25	Vuckmer. I am a citizen or as referred to by a
	1

panelist, I'm a consumer. I object to that classification. I'm here as a citizen and a resident of Virginia. I want to state very clearly that perception in my opinion is reality. Everyone creates their own reality, so I'm speaking in terms of my own, really for my wife and I.

I'm going to speak about a reality that is my perception and the perception is that what I've heard today, we're really talking about corporate policy as opposed to public policy and when I say public policy I mean citizen policy. I get enough phone calls and attempts to take my money as a consumer. I don't want to be thought of as a consumer by a public agency, the FCC.

Secondly, we have lost our ability in America through the media. Free press, in my opinion, is all the media. To agree or disagree, we have come, I think, in a fashion and form now where it's only fashionable to agree. Whatever the opinion is that is being pushed, by the media, by whatever media outlet, is the one which we're expected to agree, with which we're expected to agree. And I disagree with that.

I think a free press, a free media means that there's this antagonism that everyone talked about in this room that allows free exchange  $o\!f$  ideas

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2 1

resolution as a result of that disagreement. 2 3 That isn't happening any more. I think what we're finding -- my real concern is news. 4 5 we're getting a lot more entertainment than we are The content is awful. For those people who run 6 7 stations, media outlets, you need to understand we're tired of the garbage, in my opinion, what we're 8 getting served up as news is not news. It is 9 10 entertainment. Finally, I want to say that the experiment 11 in Richmond was we used to have more than two 12 We eventually had two newspapers and newspapers. 13 those two newspapers were merged. One I found was a 14 little bit more moderate than the surviving entity --15 MR. KRATTENMAKER: Thank you, Mr. Vuckmer. 16 You can submit your information for the record as 17 well. 18 We're now going to begin to alternate. 19 We'll start with the right and go to the left. Again, 20 two minutes. Yes sir. 21 MR. LABLAU: Yes, Mr. Commissioner, 22 Members of the Commission, my name is Danny Lablau 23 (Phonetic). I'm President of the Virginia State AFL-24 25 CIO that represents over 200,000 working families here

whether you agree or disagree, but you come to some

in the State of Virginia. These working families depend upon a diverse and free media to participate in our democracy. I'm worried about the concentration of media ownership into fewer and fewer hands. Here, in Richmond, a city of over 200,000 people, the state capital, we have one daily newspaper, The Richmond Times-Diseatch. It's owned by Media General with a circulation of about 200,000 with about 230,000 on We have three TV stations, the ABC, CBS and Sunday. NBC affiliates which produce local news shows four times a day. The Fox affiliate produces a 10 p.m. There are no locally produced cable news newscast. So we have four or five, if you include Fox, as major news sources in Richmond. If you allow any of them to merge, we'd only have three or four.

Just look at what happened to radio in Richmond since the 1996 Telecommunications Act dropped its national radioship ownership rule. The four largest radio stations now control 90 percent of the market, according to your study. The number of independent radio station owners in Richmond has dropped 31 percent since 1996.

Now I hear that Media General, the owner of the major newspaper is into something called convergence. They want to own a TV station where they

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

own a newspaper and then share the news operation. 1 2 fear they have Richmond on their radar screen. I shudder to think what this would mean. 3 4 They would dominate the news market and drive up ad Working people have a hard enough time 5 prices. getting fair reporting in this state. If we even have 6 7 fewer media owners, it would be even harder to get 8 fair coverage from workers' point of view. Politicians would have to pay even more 9 for their ads, print and media or electronic media. 10 MR. KRATTENMAKER: Thank you, sir. 11 remind you to please state your name for the record as 12 well. 13 Ma'am? 14 MS. SMITH: My name is Laura Smith and I'm 15 from Austin, Texas where I'm a doctoral student at the 16 University of Texas at Austin. I also worked in 17 television news for about 13 years before I went back 18 19 to school to teach the next generation 20 broadcasters. would like to actually reference 2 1 directly the issue of duopolies and much deference to 22 23 Mr. Munson in what he's doing at WAVY. This is not in many duopoly conditions around the 24 the case 25 country.

In Jacksonville, Florida when Gannett purchased the Albritton station in 1999 under one of the first television stations allowed to do this, they immediately dismantled the news operation and fired the majority of the news staff, although they kept the entirety of the sales staff.

would like to say they simulcasting one news product television on two stations, one an ABC affiliate, the other an NBC They are maintaining the entertainment affiliate. programming, but they have disassembled entirely the news gathering operation and until those sorts of issues are addressed in what can happen both pro and con, I think that's something that the FCC really needs to take into consideration when it's looking at relaxing its duopoly rules.

I also want to mention that in the issue of the national cap, there are many companies such as Sinclair and others who are looking at going to regional casting as a result of being able to purchase more television stations around the country. This means they'll inevitably knock off local producers and reporters in order to go to a regional casting issue. This is something that local citizens need to be aware of and that the FCC, I think, should be

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

responsible for protecting their interests when they
get out there.

Finally, I'd like to just make a quick

statement about the quality of the 12 empirical studies that the FCC is going to base its decision on. I've read all 12 of them and in due deference to the FCC Members who are here who worked on those studies, there is a great deal of missing data in those studies, the theoretical foundations, the social science research there. As a social scientist now and a former journalist, I have great issue with some of the quality controls that were put in place in how this issue is being measured by the FCC. I think we need a great deal more research before you take any further steps and I applaud Commissioner Copps for his willingness to do more public hearings because people talking at a hearing like this is not nearly enough.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. KRATTENMAKER: Thank you. This will be the last public comment before we go to the **next** panel, but I'll ask a member of **my** staff to come over and get the names so we can start the list again.

Yes ma'am.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 MS. BALATTA-DALY (Phonetic): My name is 2 Darva Balatta-Daly and I'm a volunteer with the 3 Prometheus Radio Project in Philadelphia, although I 4 drove down from Upstate New York where I live to be 5 this. Thank you, Commissioner Copps, for giving me the opportunity to drive 800 miles. Ι 6 7 appreciate it. I do. a

How did the FCC get away for 70 years without having any empirical basis to these rules?

(Laughter.)

Ownership is power that's well understood. I don't think that we need an economist to tell us that.

The public interest, diversity and localism, those issues get thrown around and they expand and contract through this room with each person that talks about them. I have my own version of that and I'd like to share an anecdote with you. I was at a low power FM station a couple of years ago. unlicensed because the community wasn't served and there wasn't the possibility of getting a license. they pitched in and got some equipment, put it up in a house and everybody in that neighborhood listened to If the police were out, or if somebody would call out, hey the police are out, everybody would be out on

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the street to see what the police were about. I had the opportunity to see this with my own eyes.

A viewer called into the station and said I don't know where my daughter is, has anybody seen her? The DJ announced that. A minute later, the phone rang and she's on her way home. That is the kind of diversity and localism that we're talking about.

Two hundred forty-seven different ethnicities that Americans identify, that's what the Census says. You've got the census data available. You can use that. Forty-one different language families. Creole is spoken in the United States, not just Spanish and English.

We've got a real different idea of what character of community can be and what localism can be. I hope that the FCC will seriously consider the social science aspect of this and look very closely at what the relationship is between a market area which is created by industry data and is used by the industry and what actually communities are. Okay? Because I don't think that there's a correlation, but it's the FCC's job to prove to the public that there is a correlation.

The same thing goes for consumers versus

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

	205
1	citizens. The FCC, if you believe that consumers and
2	citizens are the same thing, then prove it to us.
3	Show it. Make it transparent.
4	MR. KRATTENMAKER: Thank you very much.
5	(Applause)
6	MR. KRATTENMAKER: We're going <i>to</i> begin
7	the next panel. Please get ready.
8	(Pause.)
9	As the Chairman explained, we're
10	regretfully trimming you down to four and a half
11	minutes. When the red light comes on, will you please
12	stop and so I shall shut up and give you the time you
13	have remaining.
14	I'm sorry, I'm going to mispronounce, Mr.
15	Blethen.
16	MR. BLETHEN: I'm Frank Blethen. I'm the
17	publisher of <u>The Seattle Times</u> . <u>The Times</u> is a 106-
18	year-old family business. For five generations, my
19	family has passionately pursued <b>a</b> singular obligation,
20	to fulfill our public trust responsibility to serve
21	our communities with independent journalism that's
22	relevant to them.
23	I'm here today because American democracy
24	is in crisis. It is at risk. A democracy needs a

free and independent press to survive. In the words

1	of a great journalist, Walter Lipman speaking about 50
2	years ago, "there is, I believe, a fundamental reason
3	why the American press is strong enough to remain
4	free. That reason is the American newspaper, large
5	and small, and without exception belongs to a town, a
6	city, at the most a region."
7	We are long past our free press because
8	few newspapers and few media outlets any longer belong
9	to a town or a region. The loss is being driven by
10	two troubling trends, one is the egregious ownership
11	concentration and loss of local connection for
12	newspapers, television, radio and cable. The other is
13	the insidious transformation of our large media
14	companies into ownership by Wall Street financial
15	investors. Wall Street has a singular
16	[END TAPE 3, SIDE B; BEGIN TAPE 4, SIDE
17	A.1
18	term earnings and stock price. Not
19	news, not public service and not democracy.
20	The specter of media dominance by a small
21	handful of conglomerates controlled by faceless,
22	financial institutions and driven by CEO stock options
23	is enough to scare George Orwell.
24	When I started with my career, there were
25	about 1500 daily newspapers in the United States, most

locally or regionally owned. Today, only 35 years later, there are only about 280 independent daily newspapers left and very, very few serving metropolitan areas.

In the old days, long tenured publishers and editors had deep connections with the cities and regions they served. Today, few publishers, editors or station managers even come from the communities they work in. Few of them stay very long. Few publishers have news backgrounds or even news sensibilities.

America's news rooms have quietly been transformed from democracy's watchdog into corporate lapdogs. One only needs to ask why FCC pleadings to relax radio and TV concentration rules and to repeal the cross ownership trend have been outside the bright light of press scrutiny. When huge corporations lobbying for their own financial self-interest also control most of our news rooms, does anybody wonder why there is such a chill?

I've heard the arguments of proponents of cross ownership repealed. I've noted that they are made only by large companies driven by the quest to grow ever larger. The most frequent argument is that the internet and cable have created information and

access proliferation. That is not accurate. There are still limited sources of professional, credible news and opinion. Indeed, the public company quest for ever higher profits have put incredible pressure on our remaining few news rooms. Most journalists believe there has been a serious disinvestment in news and a dumbing down of media, in general.

The correct issue is whether we still have and can maintain well-staffed, professional news rooms that can keep Americans informed about their community and about their country. Getting the same often shallow information delivered a thousand different ways does not provide a substitute for robust, independent, news generation.

This argument also ignores that single corporate entities are now using their various platforms and extensive control to simply recycle information and programming and to promote their own products often in the guise of news.

I urge the Commission to return to your most basic obligation, to ensure we preserve and nurture our democracy. Your obligation is bigger than cross ownership or the other concentration rules, but that's what's in front of us. Repeal of cross ownership and relaxing of the other rules would be a

giant crack in the foundation of our democracy. 1 2 have seen the unintended consequences of the 1996 3 Telecommunications Act. We're beginning to see the 4 negative consequences of the Commission's relaxing of 5 other radio and TV concentrations --MR. KRATTENMAKER: Thank you, Mr. Blethen. 6 7 Your time is up. Mr. Herwitz? 8 9 MR. HERWITZ: Good afternoon. My name is 10 Tom Herwitz. I'm President of Station Operations for Fox Television Stations. Given our record in local 11 news and service, we at Fox are frankly confounded by 12 13 the argument that allowing us to **own** stations that reach more than 35 percent of 14 the 15 threaten competition, diversity and localism. 16 I'll show today that the opposite is true. 17 Today, at our stations, 35 stations across the country, we produce and air more than 800 hours of 18 19 original, regularly scheduled local news per week, 20 more than anybody else in the country. I joined Fox from the FCC actually in 1986 21 when our first six stations were bought. 22 Those stations did 23.5 hours of news and three of them in 23 Dallas and Chicago and Houston aired no news at all. 24

Today, those same stations produce every week 195

hours of local news, an eight-fold increase. And on the stat on in Dallas, for example, we broadcast 43 hours per week.

In many markets, we've produced and aired more local news by 9 a.m. than our competitors will air all day long. What empirical justification is there to keep Fox from bringing this kind of commitment to additional communities?

We also provide local news service that is unique to many communities, often in dayparts where there is no other local news and prime time and in the morning. We're baffled that some broadcasts say they're more local, more dedicated to serving their local communities than Fox because their group doesn't The facts completely belie this. reach 35 percent. Deb McDermott who is down to my left is a wonderful broadcaster, but her Richmond station here is not more When I call her, I call her in local than ours. Nashville and I call Vince Young in New York City. Our local managers, as theirs, have editorial autonomy which we believe benefits the stations as well as the viewers.

Secondly, we emphatically dispute that our stations have less than the highest commitment to serving their local communities. Take our station in

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Detroit, WJBK, which I use because of one our principal competitors there, WDIV, is owned by Post Newsweek station, an outspoken advocate of keeping the 35 percent cap, arguing that companies whose stations don't reach the cap are better local operators. we have 50 percent more news than WDIV. Our station has been chosen Broadcasters Association station of the year four years in a row. Our problem solving news takes on local Detroit issues every day. We shut down prostitution rings near schools. school district to recognize that they were operating abandoned buildings that were drug and prostitution and rat-infested by schools. We brought attention of the Detroit Water and Sewage Department that had to clean up their operations after we showed workers spending their days drinking, smoking marijuana and dangerously driving large city-owned trucks while intoxicated.

WDIV is a strong competitor and whether they're better or worse than us really isn't the point. It seems that if the Commission's task as the Court seems to order is to find empirical evidence to justify preventing Fox from owning additional stations in light of the facts, the hard evidence of our stations' service in communities like Detroit, it's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

hard to understand what Post Newsweek or any of the 1 2 other evidence is or possibly could be. Given this commitment to our local 3 communities, what is the evidence that our ownership 4 5 harms competition, diversity and localism? Given our track record, how can the government justify a rule 6 7 requires us shut down stations or to stations in Austin where we do 30 hours; Greensboro, 8 35 hours; Birmingham, 41; we're the news leader there; 9 Kansas City, 48 hours, in order to get below a 35 10 11 percent cap. 12 MR. KRATTENMAKER: Thank you, Mr. Herwitz. We'll take those 13 last three questions, not questions, but as statements. 14 15 Mr. Mays? MR, MAYS: Good afternoon. 16 HERWITZ: I'm sorry, can I 17 18 finish. I just want to say that we believe and I think it's shown that what we brought, what Fox has 19 brought through Rupert Murdoch's version through the 20 [Inaudible] deregulation and other things that we have 2 1 22 brought to --23 MR. KRATTENMAKER: Mr. Herwitz, I'm sorry, 24 I believe that we have heard and I believe that in all 25 fairness to the other members of this panel, I should move along.

2 1

Mr. Mays?

MR. MAYS: Good afternoon, Chairman Powell and Members of the Commission. My name is Mark Mays and I'm the president and chief operating officer of Clear Channel Communications. Thank you for inviting me to testify about the importance of localism in radio broadcasting.

Some have spoken of the radio experience as the canary in the coal mine, providing evidence of the dangers of deregulation, dangers, they say, that await other media that would follow in radio's footsteps. But this analogy, although it may be colorful, just doesn't apply for one simple reason. The canary isn't dead. To the contrary, it is alive and well, healthier and more robust than ever before, far from being dead, radio is experiencing a new vitality and is providing excellent service to local communities all over the country.

In order to fully appreciate the new vitality of the radio industry, you must remember back to the early 1990s when many stations were simply struggling to survive. It was a different world then, just 10 years ago. Half of all radio stations operated in the red and many others close to it.

Of course, the first thing many of these stations did in those rough financial times was cut their local news budget and even shut down a news department entirely. Local audiences suffered. Though with deregulation and the ability to own more stations, companies like Clear Channel could create economies of scale and benefit from cost savings. And we, like many other broadcasters have reinvested those savings in our stations improving technical facilities, hiring better on-air talent and increasing the quality of local programming.

Study after study demonstrates that consolidation has led to increases in the diversity of formats available to listeners and local markets, large and small. Here in Richmond, there were only 16 different formats in 1995. In 2002, that number has grown to 25. That's more than a 50 percent increase since deregulation.

Now it's true that while there are more formats, there are fewer owners. It's also true that Clear Channel owns 1200 radio stations. However, it's important to put those numbers in context. While Clear Channel owns 1200 stations, that represents just 9 percent of all the radio stations in the U.S. Put another way, more than 90 percent of U.S. radio

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

stations are owned by nearly 4,000 other companies.

I'm not here to dispute the fact that we're a large company or that consolidation has occurred, but I will strongly dispute the notion that consolidation has led to a reduction in localism. We succeed by intimately knowing the local community we serve and tailoring our programming to meet their unique needs and tastes. This is true every minute of every hour of every day.

If listeners don't like what they hear, they will turn the dial. It's that simple. One tired song, one commercial break that lasts too long or a failure to provide timely news or traffic and the listener is gone. That's why we run Clear Channel in a completely decentralized manner. We operate like an association of small, local businesses. Our local station managers and program directors make every decision about what music gets played on our stations and how often. They develop the play list based on extensive local audience research, listener requests and first hand knowledge of their own communities. Clear Channel, there is no such thing as standardized play list.

To those who would say that radio has become more homogenized since deregulation, let me

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

dispel that myth as well. Since 1999, the number of unique songs and artists we play has increased by 30 percent, reflecting the fact that Clear Channel radio stations are actually playing a greater variety of I'm pleased to say that our music every year. dedication to localism has been recognized time and time again. Last year, our Richmond stations won awards ranging from best locally produced radio show, to best traffic reports, to best local broadcaster of the year. And our local managers take great pains to introduce listeners to new artists. Here in Richmond, for example, WRXL, there's a one hour program each Sunday night featuring local and regional bands. the road in Washington, D.C., DC-101 New Music Mart every Sunday night.

In fact Carbonleaf, an unsigned band from right here in Richmond, has seen its music move from the Sunday night show to DC-101 power rotation. But we don't just serve our communities by playing the music our listeners want to hear. Clear Channel stations around the country are deeply involved in a wide variety of local, civic and charitable events.

The bottom line is that good radio is local radio.

MR. KRATTENMAKER: Thank you, Mr. Mays.

## **NEALR GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Ms. McDermott?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

25

MS. McDERMOTT: Thank you for conducting today's hearing in Richmond and for allowing me to appear. I'm executive vice president of Young Broadcasting, Inc. which owns and operates 11 television stations in various markets, including WRIC-TV, an ABC affiliate in Richmond.

I respectfully urge the Commission not to modify or repeal the 35 percent national television The 35 percent cap is essential to ownership cap. the localism, bedrock principle which on the congressionally mandated broadcast system is based. The principle of localism is uniquely American. has its roots in our federalist system of government. As Virginia's favorite son, Thomas Jefferson warned his friend, Gideon Granger in 1800, our country is too large to have all of its affairs directed by a single Public servants at such a distance and government. from under the eye of their constituents must, from the circumstance of distance, be unable to administer and overlook all the details necessary for the good government of the citizens.

For the very same reason, Congress rejected the notion of a highly centralized system of terrestrial broadcasting. Unlike the governments of

Europe, Congress opted for a system that would assure fullest possible the extent that America's to television stations would be responsive to the special needs and interests of the local communities they are licensed to serve. As it is self-evident today, as when Congress created the current system broadcasting, that it is not in the national interest all the nation's television broadcast to have programming dictated each day, every day, seven days a week, 52 weeks a year and year after year by a handful of station owners.

Some of you have asked, how would viewers know the difference if the cap were raised? Viewers will know because network owned stations must serve their parent network national and international program distribution interests and the interests of their station's local viewers. Those interests are often in conflict. A non-network owned station in contrast has but a single responsibility to only serve the interests of its local viewers. The interests of local viewers is the essence of localism.

Localism has meant that the citizens of Springfield, Missouri were spared an episode of NBC's Fear Factor when the local station determined the program would be offensive to local viewers. No NBC

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

station rejected, to my knowledge, a single episode of that show.

Localism has meant that viewers in North Dakota, Virginia, South Dakota, South Carolina and other states have been able to watch Billy Graham on their local stations. That, of course, would not have occurred if these stations had been owned by a network. Localism has meant a Fox affiliate in Raleigh, North Carolina was able to reject Fox's "Temptation Island" because it refused in its words to support a program that could potentially break up the parents of a young child. To my knowledge, none of the Fox owned stations rejected "Temptation Island."

Localism has also meant that NBC affiliates collectively were able to persuade NBC to allow them to carry a presidential debate rather than a major league baseball playoff game scheduled by the NBC network. None of that, of course, would have occurred had NBC owned their affiliate.

For 20 years, our company's Louisiana station has aired a live broadcast of the rosary in a very Catholic area, early each morning. When we wanted to expand our local news and move the start time of the rosary program, our network vehemently objected because the rosary program would encroach on

the network's early national news. If our station 1 were owned by the network, the rosary would not be on 2 the air.

4

5 6

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

increase in the national cap will reduce the number of television stations to which independent program producers can sell programming and in turn will eventually reduce the already small number of independent program companies. This is, of course, of great concern to our company. Right now, 70 to 80 percent of our programming comes from the network and with some companies, 100 percent of our syndicated programming is coming from one syndicated company.

The balance of power in the program market has already shifted to the networks. If you raise the cap, you will nationalize the nation's local broadcast The network argument for increasing or system. repealing the cap is purely financial. They claim longer compete unless they acquire they can no ownership of their affiliates. It is a tired and hollow argument. The networks have made it for years. If the networks owned television stations in America they would have the same argument.

1 don't know what Thomas Jefferson would think about the "Fear Factor" if he were alive today,

nor do I know if he would enjoy a Billy Graham Crusade, a presidential debate or a rosary program, but I think he would concur that the local television station in Charlottesville should reflect the core values of the people of Charlottesville and not merely the national and international program interests of a major national television network.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. KRATTENMAKER: Thank 'ou. Mr. Powell?

MR. POWELL: Thank you. My name is Chris

Powell. I'm the managing editor of the Journal

Inquirer in Manchester, Connecticut, the daily

newspaper serving 17 towns east and north of Hartford.

I'm here to protest Tribune Company's monopolization

of the news media in Connecticut and to urge the

Commission to enforce the cross ownership rule against

Tribune instead of repealing the rule.

The Tribune already owned two of the six privately held television broadcast licenses in Connecticut three years ago when it bought the Times Mirror newspaper chain. Acquiring Times Mirror, Tribune became owner of Connecticut's largest daily newspaper, the Hartford Courant, two other Connecticut dailies, the Stamford Advocate and Greenwich Time; the

four weekly newspapers of the <u>Advocate</u> chain Hartford, Fairfield County and New Haven, Connecticut Springfield, Massachusetts and the Valu-Mail direct mail advertising company in Hartford. Tribune acquired Times Mirror, news reporting said that a big part of the corporate plan was to obtain control of TV stations and newspapers and overlapping markets and coordinate their operations to in deliberate violation of the cross ownership rule, but in anticipation of the rule's repeal. That is what has come to pass in Connecticut, where the Courant's and Tribune's two TV stations now promote each other constantly and exchange features.

Tribune now uses its grant of government monopoly on two channels on the public airwaves to give the Courant a big advantage over all the other newspapers in Connecticut, the Courant has made exclusionary contracts with newspaper feature syndicates. That is, the <u>Courant</u> has made its purchase of certain newspaper features conditional on promises by the feature syndicates not to sell those newspaper features to my paper.

The worsening concentration of ownership in the news media in Connecticut does not end with Tribune Company. In the last few years, the Journal

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Register newspaper chain has obtained not only the daily newspaper in New Haven, but also the weekly newspapers in New Haven suburbs and the Media News Group newspaper chain has obtained not only the daily Bridgeport, but also newspaper in the weekly in Bridgeport suburbs, that Connecticut the so-called alternative press is now owned by the same big company downtown.

Announcing today's hearing the FCC press release of February 7th said "the FCC's goal is to promote competition, diversity and localism in the media." I'd like to know how competition, diversity and localism in the media are promoted by the FCC's giving two of Connecticut's six privately held TV broadcast licenses to an out of state conglomerate that already owns three major newspapers, three weekly newspapers and a direct mail company in the state when as a practical matter no other newspaper company in Connecticut can have even one broadcast license.

Some people say the cross ownership rule should be repealed because the internet and cable television are providing plenty of competition in the news media. I don't know where these people live but they can't be living in Connecticut. The state and local news and advertising provided by the internet

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

and cable TV in Connecticut are negligible. News and advertising in Connecticut are 99 percent matters of TV and radio broadcasters and newspapers.

Indeed, if the internet and cable TV were really providing so much competition in the media, the conglomerates would be happy to expand by enterprise that way instead of by acquisition of the existing traditional media properties, existing broadcasters and newspapers. But no, Tribune and other big media companies are expanding through cross ownership of existing properties because the big media companies consider cross ownership to be their best opportunity for growth and gaining control of a market.

The awarding of broadcast licenses -government grants of monopoly on the public airwaves -can be conducted in only two ways, to diversify
ownership of the media or to concentrate ownership.
The cross ownership rule has been a small, but clear
affirmation that diversification is better than
concentration. On a national basis, it has been a
guarantee of a little diversification, though only a
tiny fraction of the diversification we could have.

I have never understood why we let anybody have more than one broadcast license in this country.

Repeal the cross ownership rule and we are

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

sure to get a lot of the concentration that it was meant to prevent. That is precisely why the FCC is being asked to repeal the rule. Repeal the cross ownership rule and by government decree and patronage, Connecticut will be awarded the Tribune Company. We're a small state, but we deserve better public policy than that.

Thank you.

2.0

(Applause)

MR. KRATTENMAKER: Thank you. Mr. Sturm?

MR. STURM: Good afternoon. I'm John

Sturm, president and CEO of the Newspaper Association

of America. I'm grateful for the opportunity to

appear before you this morning, this afternoon,

because in the 28 years since the newspaper broadcast

cross ownership rule went into effect, my association

has never had an opportunity before to bring our view

I will take the next few minutes to demonstrate the important role that newspaper broadcast cross ownership can play in enhancing the quality and the quantity of news and other local content available to the public. Once upon a time, long ago, the FCC affirmatively encouraged the participation of newspaper publishers in the broadcast

of this issue in front of the Commission.

industry. Even in its 1975 order adopting the ban, the FCC expressly recognized the traditions of service that newspaper publishers brought to the broadcasting industry. These facts have not changed.

The Commission also found in 1975 that there was no evidence that commonly owned newspaper and broadcast stations posed any threat of any competitive behavior and that, on average, stations co-owned with local, daily newspapers, provided more news and nonentertainment programming than other TV stations. Happily, these facts too have not changed.

It makes perfect sense that newspaper owned broadcast stations would excel in news coverage and informational programming given their extensive news gathering resources and their strong ties with the community. Indeed, daily newspapers are by their very nature more deeply involved in and aware of the activities, concerns, and issues affecting their local communities.

The best evidence of the impact of cross ownership can be found in another set of facts, the records of the 40 grandfathered newspaper broadcast accommodations that exist today, representing the full gamut of market sizes from Mile City, Montana to Chicago, Illinois. These co-owned facilities

consistently have provided their home communities with unmatched levels of service. By way of example, in the Cedar Rapids, Iowa market, KCRG-TV, KCRG-AM, which are jointly owned by the <u>Cedar Rapids Gazette</u>, offer more news than any other stations in their markets. The stations make use of a wide array of newspaper resources, including an ombudsman employed by the <u>Gazette</u> to review the fairness and accuracy of the news reports offered by both the TV station and the newspaper.

Similar y, WEOL-AM, co-owned with the Chronicle Telesram in Lorraine, Ohio, provides an impressive 24 hour news service with the local news every hour on the hour as well as news summaries every half hour during the morning and afternoon drive.

And finally, in the much smaller Sioux City, Nebraska market, WJAG, Inc., owns both the Norfolk Daily News and WJAG-AM. As a result of this cross ownership, WJAG has built a solid reputation for its news reporting, operations, earning it more than 35 awards in the past several years.

These and the numerous other firsthand experiences in other markets have been filed in the Commission's record by NAA and many other parties such as Gannett in Phoenix, Media General in Tampa, Belo

(Phonetic) in Dallas and Tribune in Chicago, Los Angeles and other markets.

These results are confirmed by the FCC's sponsored studies that have been conducted newspaper broadcast cross ownership. Indeed, while there have been some criticisms of some of these studies, the evidence that broadcast stations jointly owned with daily newspapers provide your communities with both more and higher quality and news informational programming has not been seriously questioned.

Specifically, the Spavins Study found that affiliates co-owned with newspapers experience noticeably greater success under our measures of quality and quantity of local news programming than other network affiliates.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Commission's record establishes this set of facts that must guide your decision on this matter. The media world is totally different now as compared to when this ban went into effect in 1975; no one can seriously suggest otherwise. Second, the experiences in the 40 grandfathered markets over 28 years have demonstrated of complete absence harm. And third. Commission's record and your own studies, reveal an

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

abundance of superior service by newspaper-owned local The ban is long outdated, has no current stations. basis and should be immediately repealed in full. only thing proven that this ban has done is deny interest benefits to the great number of public markets in this country. MR KRATTENMAKER: Thank you, Mr. Sturm. Ms. Toomey? MS. TOOMEY: Good morning. On behalf of the Future of Music Coalition, I want to thank you for the honor of testifying today and I also want to thank the inspiring audience for coming out and letting their voices be heard. My name is Jenny Toomey.

I'm a rocker and a businesswoman and an activist and I speak to you today as a working musician and the executive director the Future of Music Coalition. Most working musicians aren't super stars. Rather, they're independent and local. For the past three years, the Future of Music has worked on issues from webcasting to health care, but one issue unites our entire constituency and that's lack of access to the radio.

Given these concerns, last February we 8-month research project to examine the problem. In the study we asked the basic questions,

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

how has ownership of commercial radio changed and does the radio serve the essential regulatory priorities of localism, competition and diversity?

Our study finds the following: there is scant evidence that these priorities are improved in any way by the radical restructuring of the industry that has taken place over the past six years. Rather, this restructuring has damaged a precious public resource. Localism has withered. The industry has lost one third of its owners and every local market is controlled by four companies or fewer.

Those few independent operators who are less concerned with reaching the most attractive demographics cannot compete in an environment where a handful of media corporations control every local market. And there is scant evidence that radio listeners, radio talent, government, social service agencies and the music community does not benefit from these changes.

The fundamental regulatory structures that have governed radio for decades are overturned and the public deserves an accounting of the impact of these changes and a true seat at the table as further changes are debated.

The radio industry defends its

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

consolidated state by pointing at the other industries and saying we're not as bad as those guys, but they aren't those guys. Radio is not private property. Radio is a public resource, regulated by the government on behalf of citizens. The question is not the gross number of owners. The question is how many owners exert control in a local market.

When measured according to market concentrations of both listenership and advertising dollars, radio demonstrates the same principles of oligopolistic control now.

In virtually every local market of the country, four companies or fewer control over 70 percent of the market and in most cases those owners are not local.

The broadcast industry claims this reduction in local ownership is not a problem. In fact, they say fewer owners in a market leads to more diversity. They say radio companies will avoid competing with themselves in single format in a single market. Yet, our study found regular and substantial overlap between supposedly distinct formats. In the most extreme case, in the week of August 2, 2002, the national charts for two supposedly distinct formats overlapped at a 76 percent level. In other words, 38

of the **50** songs on the to play list were the exact same songs.

Furthermore, this argument misses the fundamental logic of the value of the station group. The primary goal of the station group is to attract the largest possible number of listeners and the most attractive demographics and (2) to ensure that if a listener changes a station, they change it to another station owned by the parent company. In words, the incentive is not to provide diversity of programming to serve local communities with a range of news, entertainment and information. The economic incentive is to assemble a homogenous landscape of overlapping and economically lucrative audiences that generate the most revenue.

the February 18th issue of Magazine, Clear Channel CEO Lowery Mays articulated the importance of revenue generation at his company. He said "we're not in the business of providing news information. We're not in the business of providing well researched music. We're simply in the business of selling our customers products." This, I would argue is the fundamental problem at the heart of the media deregulation. The stated effort to promote localism and diversity through competit on, less

# **NEALR. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

oversight has merely led to an increased emphasis on the bottom line. On the expense side, the incentive for radio companies is to centralize operations, increasing the use of syndicated programming, applying new technologies like voice tracking and cutting costs. In many cases, this syndicated programming is also owned by the radio parent company.

These strategies increase profit of the parent company, while diminishing the local connection between the citizen and locally licensed station.

Our radio study makes a strong case that concentration has distorted the health and functioning of the radio market, but there are signs of this negative change that go beyond the numbers in our At the most recent Future of Music policy study. summit, Congressman Mark Foley explained that as a result of radio deregulation, the number of that would provide him stations access constituents has diminished from five to one. suspect the station owners like Mr. Mays who decided that the kind of local news programming that would have previously welcomed the Congressman on to the airways is now not cost effective.

If this is happening in Florida, we can bet it's happening all over the country and if this

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

234 doesn't raise questions about 1 the damage that 2 increased consolidation could inflict upon our 3 participatory democracy, I don't know what does. 4 (Applause.) 5 MR KRATTENMAKER: Thank you. I would like to thank the entire panel and two particulars. 6 7 One, I've noticed that all the Commissioners have said 8 will you please bring us facts and data with which we can assess our rules and I think every single one of 9 10 ou really listened to that. I think you really need to be commended for it. 11 Secondly, I'm not going to apologize for 12 the weather because I didn't create it, but I do want 13 to say that I'm sorry, I appreciate the way you all 14 condensed your remarks to 90 percent of the already 15 condensed that you intended to bring here and I think 16 17 you showed great good spirit and good charm about it. Thank you very much. 18 We to questions from the 19 turn 20 Commissioners now. I realized I'd been going in the same direction every time. That's not fair to 21 22 Commissioner Martin, so I thought I'd start with you, 23 sir.

> COMMISSIONER MARTIN: In the interest of letting the public go ahead and comment as much as

24

1	possible, I'll pass.
2	MR. KRATTENMAKER: Commissioner Abernathy?
3	COMMISSIONER ABERNATHY: I'm going to do
4	the same thing.
5	MR. KRATTENMAKER: Chairman Powell?
6	CHAIRMAN POWELL: I'll pass too. I had
7	one status report though that I wanted to share with
8	Mr. Mays because it was Commissioner Adelstein that
9	sent that canary down into the mine to test the air
10	down there and we just heard back from him this
11	morning and you're right, he's not dead. Actually,
12	what happened when he flew into the mine, he
13	immediately got acquired and he's now programming 12
14	radio stations from the coal mine.
15	(Laughter and applause.)
16	MR. KRATTENMAKER: Commissioner Adelstein?
17	COMMISSIONER ADELSTEIN: I guess Mr. Mays
18	didn't think that the canary image flew. It just
19	didn't fly. I'm going to pass in the interest of time
20	so we can hear from the public.
21	MR. KRATTENMAKER: As much as I would like
22	to turn some questions to the Panel too, I think
23	we'll, if we have time later we'll come back to them.
24	Let's go to the public.
25	People who want to make comments, please

2 1

move up to the microphone. Watch the signal here. At the end of one minute you're going to be given a red light and we are going to cut you off, not because we don't like you, but because we want everybody to have a chance to speak.

Sir, please state your time.

MR. MAZURSKY (Phonetic): Michael Mazursky, second generation of broadcasters. I thank all of the Commissioners for coming to our city today. Welcome. My partner and I put a radio station that was on silent status back on the air. We own four AM radio stations here with the construction permit to build a fifth radio station right now. Of Mr. Mays' comments, of the diversity of formats in Richmond, we're proud to have three of those formats that we serve and we're the only ones that do that in the market.

My comment also is on what Mr. Mays was saying about how they helped the local market. They immediately, when they consolidated a few more of their stations, took off an oldies format so we have no oldies station in Richmond. They put on an urban format to compete against Radio One because they needed to do that for their national dollars -- to try to gain some of the national dollars, just is my

opinion.

My father was one of the founders of Lotus Communications, a broadcaster since 1962 in Los Angeles. I had the opportunity with my partners to buy a broken radio station here, 990 AM and I just want to tell you since 1997 we put the station back on the air. We have 35 employees. We have grouped together our stations so we do gain some efficiencies, but we have been trying since 1997 to add a night time signal on this station and we did get a construction permit.

MR. KRATTENMAKER: Thank you, sir. Your time is up.

What we're going to do, as I promised earlier --

MR. MAZURSKY: Can I say just one more thing?

MR. KRATTENMAKER: I'm sorry, sir --

MR. MAZURSKY: That it took from January of 2000, a 5-day window to accept 200 applications from AM guys like me to fix theirs so I can do more local high school sports at night, to May of 2001 until I got the construction permit and I'm still just trying to get it on because of all the zoning and land issues, but I just want to tell you that we're working

1	hard as local guys to serve the community.
2	MR. KRATTENMAKER: Please submit your 15
3	second statement for the record. Thank you.
4	MR. SNOWDEN: We're going to now go to
5	Arthur Mobley who was in line first at the last public
6	comment, if he's in line. Mr. Mobley?
7	You have two minutes, sir.
8	MR. MOBLEY: Yes, I'm going to yield most
9	of my time, but I did want to again reiterate that if
10	the Commission can look at how economically stations
11	make money, they'll find a better answer to some of
12	the dilemma that they're sharing. And I'd love to
13	come back and testify with a bunch of facts that I've
14	compiled also, but I'll yield the rest of my time
15	because I got to comment this morning.
16	MR. KRATTENMAKER: Thank you Mr.
17	Barrett?
18	MR. BARRETT: I'm Alan Barrett, President
19	of the Richmond Branch of the NAACP and the NAACP
20	wants to issue a brief to statement in strong
21	opposition to mergers and consolidations that would
22	undermine minority opportunities and we also want to
23	appeal to the FCC to not threaten the diversity and
24	democratic ideals that are the philosophic foundations

25

of this country.

	FCC's support for these kind of mergers
2	have done damages earlier presenters have stated. The
3	ethnic, social and cultural pluralism will suffer from
4	[Inaudible] broadcasts and print journalism supported
5	by the FCC. More restrictive control of popular
6	culture will not benefit diversity and in fact, they
7	will undermine [Inaudible] culturalism. News events
8	will become commodities that are subject to the whims
9	of corporate ownership. Controversial issues will be
10	diluted or filtered out all together. This means that
11	minority views would have less of a chance of being
12	presented. What happened to Bill Maher and
13	"Politically Incorrect" is but one example. We risk a
14	situation when indoctrination can become the
15	intentional or unintentional product $\mathbf{of}$ oligopolistic
16	media markets.
17	MR. KRATTENMAKER: Thank you, Mr. Barrett.
18	(Applause.)
19	MR. KRATTENMAKER: Mr. Richmond?
20	MR. RICHMOND: Yes, good afternoon. My
21	name is John Richmond and the only reason I'm here
22	today is normally I'd be teaching school but we got
23	snowed out so I find myself here and I'll just try to
24	get through as many as five observations as I can.

Observation 1. If you all are interested

in finding a larger slice of the public, including a larger slice of people that listen to the various types of media that are out there, hold hearings in the evenings and on weekends. That's when most of us can come out.

(Applause.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Number two, I find myself less able to find out what's going on locally than nationally because I see the media already as nationalized. There seems to be a formulaic approach to local news In the morning and again during the coverage. evening, I flip back and forth between the three major stations here. They have virtually the same stories on at virtually the same time and I don't need to know a rescue in North Dakota or a unique pie throwing contest in Texas and this type of story inevitably takes up least two minutes of at And also an extra hour of news doesn't newscast. necessarily mean an extra hour of news. Here's why. A lot of times stories get introduced or summarized that are going to be covered in more depth later on.

Three. I use radio for most of my media entertainment and in this market it seems like the same songs are playing on every station, several of which are owned by Clear Channel and so a format does

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

_	liot necessarily mean diversity because as Ms. Toomey
2	said, formats overlap.
3	Observation four. As a principal, I
4	believe that you must resist corporate, NPR and any
5	other pressure to restrict in any way the right of low
6	power broadcasters to set up as long as they don't
7	interfere with other low power broadcasters.
8	I look for views and news from all over my
9	locality, from left, right, up, down, center and the
LO	restrictions that need to be loosened are those on the
L1	establishment of low power stations such as Prometheus
L2	Radio in Philadelphia
L3	(Applause)
14	MR. KRATTENMAKER: Thank you, Mr.
15	Richmond.
16	Mr. Boone?
L7	MR. BOONE: I am Raymond H. Boone, editor
18	and publisher of the <u>Richmond Free Press</u> , the loyal
19	opposition to monopoly journalism, represented by the
20	Richmond Times Dispatch. I'm also a former journalism
2 1	professor at Howard University and I'm also a former
22	Pulitzer Prize juror on two separate occasions.
23	I stand here to reinforce a lead editorial
24	this morning that was titled "Stop Monopoly in
25	Journalism". I also stand to reinforce my letter to
	1

**NEAL R. GROSS** 

the Commissioners calling for the end of the abuse of 1 2 the first amendment which is the cornerstone which is 3 the source or the protector of our democracy. do not do that, we are fueling an internal enemy. 4 5 I think it is appropriate that you meet in 6 Richmond, a city that has suffered much because of the 7 abuse and a newspaper not respecting the amendment. 8 To give you an idea of the conditions that 9 10 an independent newspaper like the Free Press faces it is not only the monopoly, but the kind of influence 11 12 it has entrenched in the environment. An 13 the main library tossed out example, our 14 volumes, original volumes, simply because we expressed the view that was not consistent with that of the 15 monopoly publication. Just two or three weeks ago, our 16 photographer was restricted --17 18 MR. KRATTENMAKER: Thank you. One last sentence, please. 19 BOONE: 20 Restricted from photographically covering a historical swearing in ceremony of the Chief Justice while the 21 22 monopoly press was allowed to do that. 23 MR. KRATTENMAKER: Thank you, sir. 24 MR. SNOWDEN: We're going to go for 25 another 15 minutes.

Sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BENNETT: My name is Hans Bennett. independent photojournalist and editor of Insubordination Magazine from Philadelphia. I'd like the issue of diversity talk about particular, the availability of news that challenges President Bush's current war campaign. In my opinion, the corporate media's reporting on the U.S. wars has been good, but this current consolidation never threatens to make it even worse.

Despite the millions around the world that marched on February 15th against the war, Bush has said he will attack without U.N. support, despite the fact that this violates international law, the mainstream media is essentially supporting Bush in his war drive. This very scandaled, illegal war has not been addressed.

One of the clearest empirical examples of U.S. military ties to the media machine is the fact that FCC Chair, Michael Powell, is the son of a war criminal, Colin Powell. When Colin Powell presented supposed rock solid proof of Iraq's deception at the U.N. earlier this month, we did not have a critical media to challenge his statements. How many people supporting the U.S. massacre of Iraq know that --

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

MR. KRATTENMAKER: Thank you, sir, that is 2 two minutes. 3 Yes ma'am. Hello, my name is Katie Ewell 4 MS. EWELL: 5 and I work and live in Richmond and I was lucky enough 6 to catch an article about the hearings. I had no idea 7 that media ownership deregulation might happen. 8 so I took it upon myself to do a lot of research after 9 I read the article and in a lot of my research I found a lot of the opposing views. 10 I guess I'm a consumer 11 activist or a citizen activist now. I don't know what 12 you would call it, but I am not for the deregulation. 13 I see a lot of -- I don't like to have everything coming from one or two corporations. 14 I'd just like to say I wish that more people were 15 here. 16 17 I wrote a letter to the editor of the 18 Times Dispatch and unfortunately it wasn't printed and 19 it's unfair to assume that that's because Media General might have opposing views, but it's easy to 20 2 1 assume that that's why it was not printed. 22

And the biggest thing is, Chairman Powell, I know that you wanted us to bring evidence and I'm just an individual and I want to ask what can we do as individuals or concerned citizens to help you guys

23

24

2 to support our views? I could do a telephone survey or you know, 3 would you like me to document all my media intake for 4 5 a month. What can the public do to help you guys because apparently you don't have enough time to get 6 7 all the studies done together. I'm just trying to ask 8 for help so that we can help you guys. Thank you very much. 9 10 MR. KRATTENMAKER: Thank you. Yes sir. My name is James Parish and 11 MR. PARISH: 12 I'm co-founder of the Richmond Image Moving Co-op which is a nonprofit here in Richmond that promotes 13 and supports independent media makers. 14 15 I took the day off work so I could be 16 here. I had planned to be here a couple of hours, but was so encouraged by the public support that I had to 17 call in and say I needed to be somewhere else today. 18 19 And I'm glad that I have the flexibility to do that in my job and not everybody does. 20 And I would encourage you to hold some of 21 these hearings in the evenings and on the weekends. 22 23 I'm guessing if you're listening to my voice, you may have some idea where I am from at least that I grew up 24 25 I grew up in a little town, Benson, in the South.

fight the courts, to gather the evidence that you need

North Carolina. And when I'm in the South and when I'm in North Carolina, I like to turn on the radio and the TV and hear people that sound like me and when I'm in New York, I want to hear people who sound like they are from New York.

So I am for the local and last night I was in a club showing a bunch of films through my nonprofit to focus, showcase independent film makers, media makers here in Richmond. And to highlight this event so media makers would know to be here and we're doing that because it's hard to have a voice and to show our work elsewhere, so we gather in clubs with 100 to 200 people at a time. But we can do that and I encourage you to think about the local in this issue. It's important. Thank you.

MR. KRATTENMAKER: Thank you. Yes sir. (Applause.)

MR. MAZZA (Phonetic): Hi, my name is Anthony Mazza. I come from Philadelphia and my comment pertains to -- well, we've been here since about 10 o'clock this morning for approximately six hours of testimony and we've briefly heard from the public 20 minutes before lunch, about 20 minutes a little while ago and now, where we've heard four or five hours of testimony from experts and the panelists

1

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

25

**NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE , NW.

**WASHINGTON**, D **C**. 20005-3701

and I'm just wondering if this is all we have to offer as far as inviting the public into this process, then I just think that it's really deficient.

The other comment that I wanted to make was that I thought it was curious that we heard some testimony from people from NBC and from Fox and from consolidation Channel about how diversity and protects localism and we've heard some very heartfelt stories from Detroit and some other But I'm just curious where the representatives of these communities are that are the cheerleaders of this corporate protection that there are communities and representation that they're getting in these corporate forums because even groups like the tobacco industry can trot out their corporate-funded grass roots groups to talk about the evils of smoking laws and anti-smoking laws, but we haven't heard from one citizen who wasn't on the payroll of these companies come in and testify that media consolidation has done great things for my local area.

(Applause)

And I'm just wondering, I just hope that, I really hope that we have another opportunity, another public forum to hear the full range of opinions because I'm sure that they exist, but I just

don't feel that we've been given the opportunity to 1 2 hear them here today. 3 (Applause) 4 MR. KRATTENMAKER: Yes sir. 5 MR. COLLIER: My name is Chris Collier, I live in Plymouth, New Hampshire and I have 20 years' 6 7 experience in broadcasting. I then became a parent company and I have a subsidiary now. I have a child, 8 9 he's 22 years old, but he has autism and he's very 10 literal. And when he heard about the angel of public interest I couldn't explain what that was because he 11 12 wanted to know is that like Gabriel the archangel or 13 what is that? So I began to look into what was going on and I noticed there is a particular fondness for 14 15 faith-based metaphors. So I'd like --[END OF TAPE 4, SIDE A; BEGIN TAPE 4, SIDE 16 B.] 17 18 -- if we're to believe that market can be 19 a religion, then we can take that to be the church started by David Zarnoff. David and his well-financed 20 21 legion of corporate lawyers who are responsible for keeping FM radio out of our hands for decades. David 22 told his followers the following parable: what's good 23

for RCA is good for the USA. That breaks most of the

Commandments.

24

1	The 1996 Telecommunications Act allowed
2	the money changers back in the temple and today
3	they're here with a vengeance. The angel of public
4	interest hasn't got a prayer of being heard, much less
5	seen. The only place we can eavesdrop is a 50 watt FM
6	station just outside Modesto.
7	Further deregulation is an indulgence
8	followed by a transgression. If there's to be anyone
9	with a flaming sword guarding the American public, let
10	it be the institution, the FCC, that has the power to
11	shape what we see, what we hear and how we think.
12	That's the cannon and creed that will define us, our
13	values and our society.
1 4	Thank you very much and I appreciate the
15	chance to be here today and to talk to you.
16	Thank you very much.
17	(Applause.)
18	MR. KRATTENMAKER: Thank you, sir. Yes
19	ma'am.
20	MS. RANNELL (Phonetic): Good afternoon.
2 1	My nam i Debo ah Rannell and being a former teacher
22	I do know that people can only focus for about 20
23	minutes so I do appreciate you staying with us for the
24	whole day.
25	If I heard correctly, Commissioner Copps,

you said that you were interested in the person who didn't know the FCC existed. Well, I am that clueless person that you were looking for because up until about two weeks ago I didn't know this issue even existed. So I did come here today to learn. And this is what I've learned.

Whatever side you all decide to vote on, you have your empirical evidence. I have heard some great speakers today. I think, as I said, whatever you decide to do you will have the empirical evidence to back you up.

So then what I'm thinking is that you're going to have to go to your relationships, the people you trust to make your decision. I want to be one of those people that you trust, one of those people that you listen to because I think of you as the steward of my voice.

So let me share a fear I have. I am very mainstream and conservative, at least I've been told so, so sometimes that one voice that we hear is real warm and fuzzy for me. I like that. I can go with that. But it scares me to death to think that I won't have all these other voices coming at me because those other voices give me the luxury of deciding if I'm wrong and making a change.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

	251
1	They also give me the pleasure of deciding
2	I'm right and I should stick with what I believe. And
3	I do believe that what you have heard today is that we
4	want you to trust us. We want you to listen to us.
5	You are the steward of our voice. And if we haven't
6	given you a good enough picture of the American
7	citizen
8	MR. KRATTENMAKER: Thank you, ma'am.
9	MS. RANNELL: Then go get it.
10	(Applause.)
11	MR. KRATTENMAKER: Thank you. Yes sir.
12	MR. BRIDGES: My name is Alex Bridges.
13	I'm a reporter for a small newspaper just south of
14	Richmond and I've been there about four years, got
15	there straight out of college, actually. Went here to
16	VCU and I noticed that while I was at VCU there
17	weren't any places really to work straight out of
18	college that were of the calibre of say the <u>Times</u>
19	<u>Dispatch</u> or any of these other newspapers, so you had
20	to think small and that's how most journalists get
21	their start.
22	But I've noticed that the diversity in the
23	area, across the state, I guess, has dwindled. And
24	I'm not here to argue against corporations owning
25	several newspapers across the country because they can

still do a fine job covering local events, but I think 1 that if you lift this cap, if you allow newspapers and 3 television stations and radio stations to get gobbled up by the large corporations, eventually it's not 5 going to work well and there's been a lot of evidence to show that diversity is dwindling. When you cut 6 7 away from the diversity, you also start to cut away dissemination of information which 8 from the is 9 generally the main goal of a journalist. And if you cut away from the dissemination of information, you 10 have a less educated public, a less informed public. 11 A less informed public means you have less of a 12 13 democracy than you had before.

> In my history lessons, I vaguely recall that the Soviet Union had, I believe, two media outlets for its entire country and that also included the Eastern Bloc and if you want to talk about diversity, obviously that wasn't very diverse, especially since it was controlled by the government. Well, eventually you'll have that same diversity here in America. You'll have Clear Channel and you'll have maybe even Media General owning everything in the country and then you will not have any diversity.

> > Thank you.

(Applause.)

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

4

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 MR. KRATTENMAKER: And for our final 2 public comment, yes sir.

MR. MILKUS (Phonetic): My name is Chuck Milkus I'm a former FCC attorney turned broadcaster. You heard from my partner, Mike Mazursky. We're independent AM broadcasters here in Richmond and I want to make sure that the contribution of independent broadcasters to diversity and localism not overlooked. We're doing a lot of good things here bringing new formats to the market.

I urge you that in this rulemaking, if you decide to toughen up and take some action against deregulation in response to some of the things you're hearing, please don't do it in the way that will harm small independent broadcasters who are doing the best we can to try and compete against the large group operators.

One additional comment to Mr. Mays, who made a comment about the contribution of Clear Channel to localism. An anecdote that came to mind for me is I have two children, ages 13 and 10. They prefer to listen to FM music stations, not my radio station, unfortunately, but there's a pop station in the market here, Q94. Whenever we go to another city, the first thing they do is we get in the car and they're like

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

1 Dad, where's the 494 in this city? And it usually 2 takes me about anywhere from 10 to 30 seconds to scan 3 the dial and find it and stations just sound the same when they're owned by the group owners, regardless of 4 5 what city you're in and I don't think that speaks very well for localism. 6 7 Thank you. (Applause.) 8 9 MR. KRATTENMAKER: Sir, may I ask you to 10 submit your information for th public record. 11. Thank you very much and you have the 12 floor. 13 MR BEST: My name is Glen Best and I'm 14 representing the Sierra Club and the reason I'm late 15 is because I actually got tied up in Memphis. MR. KRATTENMAKER: Will you please give us 16 17 your remarks, sir? 18 MR. BEST: Yes sir, I will. Before the 19 FCC considers any change that would further 20 consolidate media ownership, it needs to investigate 2 1 instances of censorship by owners such as those recently experienced by the Sierra Club. In the past 22 23 eight months, the Sierra Club has had two radio 24 campaign ads rejected by stations, a radio ad produced

by the club last June urging Bill Ford, CEO of Ford

Motor Company to produce more fuel efficient vehicles was rejected by Detroit stations, but later aired by a station in neighboring Canada. We shouldn't have to go to Windsor to have our ads run.

In September, another ad, critical of pollution from large dairy operations in Twin Falls and Jerome, Idaho was pulled by station owners, Clear Channel Communications one week after the station started getting -- was pulled by the station one week after they got a lot of calls in an orchestrated effort by advertisers complaining about the Sierra Club ad.

Now this isn't directly related to the FCC, but it involves Clear Channel. In October of last year, Clear Channel Communications and Viacom which own billboards in New Mexico rejected billboard ads by the Sierra Club in support of the Zuni Native American Tribe and critical of plans for an 18,000 acre strip coal mine that would harm the Zuni salt lake in western New Mexico.

I ask you this question in my closing remarks here, how can the marketplace of ideas which you're so concerned about legitimately operate in an environment where access to public airways is owned by fewer and fewer corporations that view public

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

discourse as a threat to their bottom line?

Thank you.

MR. KFSTTENMAKER: As the moderator of this session I would like to thank all of the panelists and all the contributors from the public. I thought the woman, the schoolteacher said it best, we've heard a lot of very good talks here today, not only from the panelists, but also from the members of the public.

I don't know how many public hearings at the FCC I've participated in, watched or even set up a couple. I don't think any of them were as robust or as informative as this and I think that's all due to the efforts of the Commissioners and of Dane Snowden and his staff. And I wanted to thank you, Dane, very much and give this to you to wrap up.

MR. SNOWDEN: Thank you, Tom, and thank you very much for all of your good work in moderating our panel and thank you all for coming today. If you did not have an opportunity to make a public comment and you would like to submit a comment, you can go to the FCC website at <a href="fcc.gov">fcc.gov</a> and click on the icon that says ECFS Express where you can file your comment for the record.

Madam Secretary?

#### NEAL R. GROSS

	257
1	SECRETARY DORTCH: This concludes the
2	Commission's Broadcast Ownership En Banc hearing. The
3	Commission thanks the panelists and the public for its
4	attendance. We are now adjourned.
5	(Whereupon, the public hearing <b>was</b>
6	concluded.)
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	

17